Miscarriages of JusticeUK (MOJUK)
22 Berners St, Birmingham B19 2DR
Tele: 0121- 507 0844 Email: mojuk@mojuk.org.uk Web: www.mojuk.org.uk

MOJUK: Newsletter 'Inside Out' No 684 (19/04/2018) - Cost £1

Lawyers Call For Disclosure to be Taken Out of the Hands of the Police

Jon Robins, 'The Justice Gap': Lawyers specialising in criminal appeals are calling for disclosure to be taken out of the hands of the police and prosecution following concerns that officers were being trained to bury evidence. In a joint submission to the House of Commons' justice committee, the CCA and the Cardiff University Innocence Project has called for the creation of an 'Independent Disclosure Agency'. 'Since the pervasiveness of disclosure failings is not merely a matter of inadequate resources or poor training, but also the result of in-built flaws with the current legal framework, we believe radical change is needed to ensure fair trial rights are protected,' the groups argue in their response. The idea is for a new body to consist of legally-qualified staff with full access to all police material via the HOLMES computer database. 'IDA staff should review all such material, identify and remove any genuinely sensitive information, and disclose all remaining material to both prosecution and defence,' they say. Under the proposals both parties would be given 'equal levels of disclosure' in a system that would enshrine 'if in doubt, disclose' principle as proposed in last year's report into the Cardiff 3 debacle. The author of the so called Mouncher report, barrister Richard Horwell QC noted that disclosure problems had 'blighted our criminal justice system for too long'.

CCA published evidence obtained through FOI requests which had been collated in preparation of a joint CPS Inspectorate and Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary report which was published on the same day as Horwell's report. The two watchdogs found disclosure failing were widespread and that the quality of disclosure by the police was 'poor' in more than four out of ten of cases (42%) and, in relation to the CPS handling, poor in one in three cases. The CCA received the notes from a series of focus groups with police officers, prosecutors and the judiciary. As was reported by the Times last week, the notes suggested that some officers were proactively trained to withhold from the defence. 'In even quite serious cases, officers have admitted to deliberately withholding sensitive material from us and they frequently approach us only a week before trial,' one unnamed prosecutor said. 'Officers are reluctant to investigate a defence or take statements that might assist the defence or undermine our case.' One focus group recorded: 'They did not agree on the MG6D [the schedule for sensitive material] being for issues of covert intelligence-related sensitivity only and have been trained to put items on here that they do not want disclosed to the defence.' Another said: 'If you don't want the defence to see it, then [evidence] goes on the MG6D'.

In response to the coverage, the National Police Chiefs' Council (formerly ACPO) issued a statement insisting that training did 'not in any way endorse or encourage the unnecessary withholding of any material relevant to a case'. 'It is, however, right that in cases involving sensitive unused material, such as details of an informant, that this is not automatically shared with the defence,' said the body's lead for criminal justice, chief constable Nick Ephgrave. 'This is entirely in line with legislation and national guidelines and is well understood by defence and prosecution alike.' Ephgrave added that the police recognised that investigators needed 'more effective, consistent training and advice so they have absolute clarity about the disclosure process – and this is central to the improvement plan we have put into action with the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) and College of Policing.'

Suzanne Gower, managing director of the CCA, said that the statement missed the point in two ways. 'First, it ignores the joint inspectorates' finding last year that national disclosure training was so inadequate that individual police forces were forced to arrange their own training, some of which "was subsequently shown to be wrong",' she said. Secondly, Gower said that the NPCC 'confuses legitimate use of the sensitive unused material schedule with what the documents actually revealed: namely, certain police officers incorrectly listing material on the schedule despite it not being sensitive, in an apparent bid to make sure the defence cannot see it or even request it.'

The CCA is challenging the decision by the CPS Inspectorate to withhold the identity of the police force where (it argues) officers might have been 'trained to unlawfully withhold evidence'. The charity argues that the public interest 'lies in favour of disclosure'. 'Disclosure failings can and have led both to wrongful convictions of the innocent and collapsed trials which deny justice to victims. It is therefore vital that the public – and in particular victims of miscarriages of justice and victims of crime – be allowed to know at which police force officers have apparently been trained to wrongly withhold evidence from the defence.'

'Abysmal', 'pitiful' and 'getting worse': The ability of the police to deal with disclosure was described as 'abysmal', 'pitiful' and 'getting worse', according to the notes from one prosecutor focus group. 'There is a real lack of understanding by police officers of disclosure and especially the relevancy test and by extension what needs to be revealed,' it said. 'This is a long-standing issue.' There was 'sympathy for officers and a realisation that they are under pressure', another group noted. 'It is felt that senior police management does not factor enough time for officers to be able to deal with a case following charge. Time spent on proper disclosure is a big part of this.' There were notes from some 14 police focus groups.

The identity of all forces were withheld. According to one: 'Officers often fail to consider material which may assist the defence and do not feel confident in relation to disclosure. There is a poor relationship between police and CPS underlined by a lack of communication and trust. Detectives feel that there is poor communication with lawyers. It is very difficult to speak directly with them to discuss the case and they never received feedback on how a case is going.' Another focus group comprising officers dealing 'entirely with disclosure in serious and complex cases' claimed that the CPS was 'totally overworked' and did 'not have sufficient number of lawyers' to deal with the workload.

Suzanne Gower, of the CCA, said that the documents showed 'why responsibility for providing full and fair disclosure must be taken out of the hands of police and prosecutors'. 'The truth is they see themselves first and foremost as adversaries to the defence and, in some cases, deliberately withhold exculpatory evidence. It is unrealistic to expect this mindset to change, which is why we are calling for a new independent disclosure agency consisting of legally-trained staff to take charge of the disclosure process,' she said.

Prosecutors were invited to respond to the following question: 'How confident are you in dealing with sensitive material; and are you clear about your responsibilities and about how to deal with issues surrounding sensitive material when they arise?' Answers included the following: 'The police are not trained properly and do not think. 'The average CID officer does not understand disclosure and has little or no training. Too often disclosure is an afterthought by the police and they do not enquire sufficiently.' 'Police tend to underestimate the importance of disclosure. That defence tend to exaggerate the importance of disclosure with the intention of (i) diverting prosecution (and police) time; and (ii) seeking a reason to justify an abuse of process argument or otherwise exclude evidence.' 'Training of police officers is vital; officers frequently tell us that they feel out of the depths dealing with such issues and some simply do a bad job at it. On the CPS side, more appreciation has to be made that disclosure takes time and should be dealt with not as a matter of routine. There is too much sense of 'get it done' and mark the judge's order as fulfilled for the sake of statistics.'

Serdar Mohammed v Ministry of Defence

1. The claimant in this action, Mr Serdar Mohammed, was captured by British forces in Afghanistan during a military operation in April 2010. He was suspected of being a Taliban commander and was detained by British forces for 110 days before being handed over to the Afghan authorities. He was convicted of criminal offences by an Afghan court and sentenced to 16 years' imprisonment, later reduced to 10 years on appeal.

2. In this action, which was begun in August 2012, he has alleged that his detention by British forces was unlawful. On 6 March 2013 I directed that there should be a trial of preliminary issues of law raised by the claim. That trial took place in January 2014 and I handed down judgment on 2 May 2014. Both parties appealed the decision to the Court of Appeal, which gave judgment on 30 July 2015. There were further appeals on certain issues to the Supreme Court, on which judgments were handed down on 17 January 2017. There followed a dispute about the form of the order to be made on one of those appeals, which was finally resolved on 12 April 2017. The ultimate result of the Supreme Court judgments is that, although the issues have been narrowed, a trial of disputed questions of fact is necessary in order to decide the case.

3. Since the judgments of the Supreme Court were given a year ago, the claimant has not taken any step to progress the action. In March 2017 his solicitors suggested that fixing a timetable for service of amended pleadings should await the final order of the Supreme Court. After that order was made the defendant's solicitors wrote on 31 May 2017 proposing a timetable. After some chasing the claimant's solicitors responded on 11 July 2017 saying that they were currently unable to establish contact with their client. They also indicated that they intended to submit an application on behalf of the claimant to the European Court of Human Rights. They requested a six-month stay of the proceedings to give them further time to make further attempts to contact the claimant and sought an extension of time for filing amended particulars of claim until 8 February 2018.

4. The defendant did not agree to such a stay. The correspondence between the parties' solicitors was then referred to me and I directed that a case management conference should be listed in order to determine the future of this litigation. That case management conference was listed for hearing today. In a letter dated 19 October 2017, the defendant indicated that, unless confirmation was received by the end of December that the claimant's solicitors had re-established contact with Mr Mohammed, they would apply at this hearing to strike out the claim.

5. On 22 December 2017 the claimant's solicitors sent a letter stating that they had been informed that Mr Mohammed resided in a different village to that which they had previously understood to be the case. It was said that a Red Crescent worker had been engaged to travel to the village to seek to make contact with him and that an update would be provided on 3 January 2018. On 3 January 2018 the claimant's solicitors confirmed by email that this most recent attempt to make contact with Mr Mohammed had failed, and the defendant in those circumstances issued its application for an order to strike out the claim.

6. In opposing that application on behalf of Mr Mohammed, his solicitors have served evidence which explains that they were in contact with him while he was in prison in Kabul. In June 2014 they received an email from an Afghan lawyer, Mr Shajjan, who was assisting them, to say that Mr Mohammed had been released from prison and had informed Mr Shajjan that he was with his family. In October 2014 the claimant's solicitors were told by Mr Shajjan that he had received a further telephone call from Mr Mohammed who had said that he was living in Helmand province.

7. Since then, they have heard nothing from Mr Mohammed and all attempts to contact him have failed. The only news that they have managed to obtain of his possible whereabouts is an indication that he may have moved to a different province in Afghanistan. Evidence has also been served on the claimant's behalf from Dr Giustozzi, who has expert knowledge of conditions in Afghanistan. He has explained that most of Helmand province is under the control of the Taliban, but it is possible to visit villages there if you have no connection with the Afghan government, although travelling is difficult and most of the province has no mobile phone coverage.

8. Finally, the claimant's solicitors have served evidence from an individual who has worked as a reporter in Afghanistan and has previous experience of finding missing persons there. She is willing to search for Mr Mohammed but considers that the task will take at least six months. On this basis the claimant's representatives have asked the court to stay proceedings for seven months to enable this line of inquiry to be pursued.

9. It is unusual to say the least to receive a request made by representatives of a litigant on the litigant's behalf for a stay of proceedings to give them time to try to find their client. The request also has to be considered against the background that Leigh Day have had no communication or contact with their client, direct or indirect, for over three years. It is well established by authority that it is an abuse of process to maintain proceedings without any present intention to bring them to trial: see the decision of the House of Lords in Grovit v Doctor [1997] 1 WLR 640, and the decision of the Court of Appeal in Arbuthnot Latham Bank Ltd v Trafalgar Holdings Ltd [1998] 1 WLR 1426.

10. The primary submission made on behalf of the defendant by Mr Sheldon at the hearing today is that the court can be satisfied in the light of the history that I have recounted that the claimant has no present intention to bring this case to trial. Accordingly, the claim is an abuse of process and the court should now strike it out.

11. It seems to me highly unlikely, given the facts that I have related, that Mr Mohammed does have an intention to pursue this claim to trial and that there is a realistic prospect of his doing so. A litigant who wishes to pursue a claim is expected not simply to wait to be found by his solicitors but to take some form of initiative to communicate with his representatives. The evidence filed by the claimant's solicitors does not indicate to me that it has been impossible for Mr Mohammed, for the last three years, to send a message to Mr Shajjan by some means or other to indicate his present whereabouts and desire to pursue the claim. If, on the other hand, it really has been impossible or virtually impossible to do so, then I cannot see how Mr Mohammed could realistically take this case to trial.

12. Nevertheless, perhaps out of an abundance of generosity, and because of the very unusual conditions in Afghanistan and the fact that I do not think that a further, final opportunity to contact Mr Mohammed will prejudice the defendant, I am prepared to give his representatives acting in what they perceive to be his best interests one last opportunity to try to find and make contact with Mr Mohammed using the investigator whom they have identified. I do not find myself able to be completely confident without having afforded that opportunity that Mr Mohammed has indeed decided to abandon the claim and/or that there is no realistic prospect of him, given assistance, carrying the claim forward to trial. I have to consider, amongst other factors, the background from which Mr Mohammed comes and the fact that he is an illiterate person living in a remote part of Afghanistan.

13. The order that I therefore propose to make in the circumstances is to direct that, by a date in six months' time, amended particulars of claim must be served, signed by Mr Mohammed with a statement of truth. A witness statement must also be provided explaining insofar as it can properly be done without going into privileged matters the means by which it is said that it will be possible to communicate with Mr Mohammed in a way that will enable the claim to be pursued to trial. I will direct that, unless those conditions are satisfied, the claim will on that date be automatically struck out.

Sussex Police Officer Sacked For Selling Sex

A police officer has been sacked without notice after selling himself for sex while on sick leave. Det Con Richard Holder of Sussex Police resigned before his dismissal at a disciplinary hearing on Monday. Ch Con Giles York told the hearing at force headquarters in Lewes that Holder advertised on the AdultWork.com website. The Police Federation said Holder admitted all of the allegations and had apologised for his lack of judgement. He is the second Sussex Police officer to have been caught advertising his services as a prostitute in less than two years. In December 2016, Hastings-based police constable Daniel Moss was dismissed after advertising himself as a male prostitute. Last year it also emerged Insp Tony Lumb of Sussex Police could face criminal charges over claims he had sex with women he met while on duty.

Ch Con York said Holder was accepting payment for sexual encounters at his home while he was off duty and on sick leave. He said his employment record showed a "pattern of disruptive behaviour that has been on the verge of criminal at times". The force's Police Federation chairman Matt Webb, representing Holder, said he had "fallen on his sword". Mr Webb added: "He fully admits all of the allegations set out against him. "He took a pragmatic approach to these proceedings and has resigned. He asked me to express his apologies for his lack of judgment."

Two Cheers as Alison Saunders Steps Down

Simon Warr, 'The War Zone': The news that Alison Saunders is to stand down as the Director of Public Prosecutions (DPP), at the end of her five-year contract, might bring an end to the grotesque 'target driven justice', which is synonymous with her time at the top. By common consent, Ms Saunders has not exactly covered herself – or the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) she leads – with glory. Too many things have gone disastrously wrong, too many times, and public confidence in our justice system is now at an all time low. Such is the damage, it will take much more than Ms Saunders' departure to repair what has been broken.

Although some will argue that swingeing cuts, amounting to around a quarter of its budget and a reduction in a third of its staff since 2010, have impacted on the CPS' ability to provide a high quality service, it is difficult not to conclude that the malaise goes far deeper than insufficient personnel. To my mind, the real provenance of the problem has been the blatant politicisation of the organisation, a process which started before Ms Saunders took the top job in 2013 - a job, incidentally, which pays around £205,000 per annum (plus generous benefits and a £1.8 million pension pot).

The new 'approach' to delivering so-called justice was instituted by her predecessor as DPP, Keir Starmer (now Sir Keir Starmer MP, a Labour front bencher), who was appointed in 2008. He oversaw the transformation of the CPS from a taxpayer-funded body, tasked with making decisions about prosecutions based on evidence, to an increasingly politicised machine which sought to champion trendy causes which very vocal campaigners believed should be driving our justice system. Thus began an unhealthy obsession with DPP soundbites, 'initiatives' and grandstanding for the media. Keir Starmer compromised the integrity of the CPS and Alison Saunders proceeded to exacerbate matters.

Perhaps Sir Keir's most regrettable legacy within the CPS was the importation of the ludicrous mantra, informing anyone making allegations of a sexual nature that "you will be believed", no matter how bizarre, unlikely or outlandish the claims being made. This approach came as a direct result of political pressure amidst the 'Savile effect', that collective insanity which gripped this nation after the death of the platinum haired DJ in 2011.

Once this ideological dogma had taken root within the CPS - the 2014 report by Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary said: "The presumption that a victim should always be believed should be institutionalised", - traditional approaches, such as defendants being innocent until proven guilty, the police at least making an effort to pursue open minded investigations, were promptly ditched. When Ms Saunders took up her role as DPP in 2013, she was an enthusiastic adopter and advocate and a bad situation became inevitably worse.

Back in 2014, Ms Saunders, who had spent her entire professional life working at the CPS, told one interviewer that "Nobody knew who we [the CPS] were, what we did – so I think it's good that we have a profile." Unfortunately, years of back office work in the CPS bureaucracy had ill prepared her for the DPP role and many of her key interviews became highly defensive, as public criticism of controversial CPS failures mounted. Too often it seemed that specific prosecutions – whether of investigative journalists, or of those accused of female genital mutilation or of media personalities accused of historical sexual offences – were more about getting a politically-correct result, rather than achieving justice. When these high profile cases started collapsing, the consequent damage to the CPS' reputation was inevitable; Ms Saunders' standing was similarly affected.

One of the most serious areas of concern during Ms Saunders tenure has been 'target-driven' practices, where CPS staff members are under constant pressure to achieve 'results' – that is, convictions in court. Common sense dictates that any legal system which operates on the basis of hitting specific, pre-set targets for the number of convictions in court, is at risk of multiplying miscarriages of justice, as well as encouraging prosecutors to charge potential defendants in cases where there is little or no actual evidence. This seems to have become the norm in sexual allegation cases, both modern and historical. No one can regard this as a proper, fair, sensible approach to administering justice in a country which gave the world the Magna Carta.

Another key concern was the apparent collusion between some CPS staff and police investigators over the vexed issue of disclosure of evidence – again, especially in sexual offence cases – to the defence. As evidence mounted that critical material, such as text messages and social media exchanges, were not being disclosed to defendants' legal teams, trials started to collapse. It is of no surprise that judges have become much more critical of police and CPS failures and omissions.

Of course, we should not be concerned only about innocent people who have been dragged through the courts, their reputations indelibly tarnished, and about the victims of wrongful convictions, who are suffering as a result of the current chaos within the CPS; genuine victims of serious crimes are also being let down by a system which seems to be on the brink of collapse. Will jurors be prepared to convict a defendant they feel is guilty beyond reasonable doubt if confidence in British justice is continually being eroded by failed prosecutions and repeated scandals over a lack of disclosure of evidence? Jury members will inevitably worry, perhaps, that they've not heard all the evidence and acquit.

In recent months, Ms Saunders has not helped her cause by publicly declaring that she does not believe that there are any innocent people in prison as a consequence of failures to disclose relevant evidence to the defence. What a preposterous, immature, arrogant stance to take. Just last week, a devastating report by the HMCPS Inspectorate revealed that there had been a 'steady stream of miscarriages of justice' due to poor disclosure practices. Who knows how many innocent, but wrongly convicted, men and women are currently rotting in our dangerous, over crowded, dysfunctional prisons? Does the evidence point to Ms. Saunders being naive or supremely deluded?

I don't think it is an understatement to say that there is mounting concern that the CPS and our wider justice system have come under the influence of ideologically-driven, political decision making. Collapsing trials and the unedifying prospect of innocent victims of false allegations languishing for months, or even years, on police bail, their homes ransacked, their lived trashed, have all damaged

public confidence in a system which is now so underfunded that day to day life in our magistrates' courts are akin to 'judicial A & E departments'; in short, the administering of justice on the cheap.

While Ms Saunders' personally very lucrative departure from her post is to be welcomed by all concerned about the route our justice m.o. has taken over the last decade, it will not be enough to restore faith in a system which was once the envy of the world. Fundamental reform will surely require the ditching by prosecutors of the current wholly inappropriate target-driven approach, as well as a move away from ideological fashions and fads, which have done so much damage. Is it too much to hope that the new DPP makes every effort to restore some faith in our justice system's ability to protect the innocent and, by searching for and uncovering the truth, safely to convict the guilty? Time will tell

Do Trained Lawyers Have a Human Right to Represent Themselves in Court?

ECHR held that requiring defendants to have legal representation does not violate Article 3. The vote was split by nine votes to eight. The applicant, a lawyer by training, alleged a violation of Article 3 s.3(c) of the Convention. This was on the basis of a decision by Portuguese domestic courts which (i) refused him leave to conduct his own defence in criminal proceedings against him, and (ii) required that he be represented by a lawyer. Majority view The majority view was that a member state can adopt this mandatory requirement in order to ensure a fair trial and the proper administration of justice. This was partly because an applicant's close connection to proceedings may prevent him from effectively defending himself. Such an argument was especially strong in this case, where the applicant had been suspended from the Bar. His previous conduct, namely swearing at a judge on two separate occasions and acting as defence counsel despite being suspended, formed reasonable grounds to consider he may have lacked the objectivity necessary under Portuguese law to conduct an effective defence. The Court also attached significant weight to the ability for judicial review of the measure concerned.

However, the Court noted the accused was given alternative ways of participating in proceedings. For example, he could make statements, submit observations, requests and could remain present for all parts of proceedings. He could also revoke any measure carried out on his behalf or request a change of counsel. In light of these factors, and the margin of appreciation granted to States, the Court rejected the claim.

Dissenting judgements: The dissenting judges argued that the Court's case law on Article 6 states its primary concern is to evaluate the overall fairness of criminal proceedings. It should also assess the particular circumstances of the case, using a wide range of criteria. The minority also emphasised that 31 out of the 35 Contracting Parties to the Convention have established the right to conduct one's own defence in criminal proceedings as a general rule (including the UK).

In this case, the minority view was that domestic courts exceeded their margin of appreciation in securing applicants' rights, thereby violating Article 6 ss. 1 and 3(c) of the Convention. It noted the applicant had expressly requested not to be defended by the court-appointed lawyer, that a relationship of trust between them did not exist, and that the lawyer did not endorse any of the appeals lodged by the legally trained applicant. In view of the lack of sufficient reasons provided by the State, the trial as a whole cannot be considered to have been fair.

A number of judges expressed a concern about the "paternalistic" majority view. Judge Pinto de Albuquerque was particularly spirited, describing it as: a return to the biases of the tormented black past of Europe, those biases that categorised defendants as objects in the hands of the almighty State, which could always dictate what was in their interests, even against their own will.

Jodie Rana Conviction Quashed - Not so Expert, Expert Evidence

1. On 4 September 2015 in the Crown Court at Shrewsbury the applicant was convicted of arson, being reckless as to whether life was endangered (count 1), and doing an act tending to pervert the course of justice (count 2). She was sentenced to six years' imprisonment on Count 1 by Mr Recorder Mills, with a concurrent sentence of four months' on Count 2. The prosecution case was that she had set fire to her home in the early hours of 25 October 2014, in which her parents were asleep, and immediately maliciously blamed her boyfriend by falsely suggesting that he had threatened to kill her and her family if she did not assist him with a motor claim. We will explain the facts in more detail, but part of the prosecution case was that she was within 20 or 25 metres of the house (inferentially in it) at the time the fire was started. That was supported by agreed expert evidence relating to her mobile telephone. The applicant said she was further away but it was suggested to her, in reliance on the expert evidence, that she was lying. The essence of the case advanced before us is that the expert evidence was wrong with the result that the convictions are unsafe.

Discussion:33. At the end of his cross-examination, Mr Hamer put squarely to the appellant that she had set fire to the house on the spur of the moment whilst drunk with the aim of getting her boyfriend out of her life. The prosecution case was built on the appellant's presence in the vicinity of the house and the fact that she had lied about various things, some of which she accepted. The appellant accepted that she had lied to the police about the relationship with her boyfriend having come to an end. She accepted in cross-examination that she had lied to him earlier that evening when she told him on the telephone that she was at home, rather than out with her friends. She explained that he disapproved of her going out with her friends. She accepted that she had made up the allegation in 2013. She maintained that her boyfriend had indeed threatened her and her family a week before the fire. She was cross-examined appropriately and hard over the issue arising from her iPhone connecting at 02.15.04 but maintained that her experience, despite the expert evidence, was that the phone connected and could be used from the corner at which she was dropped off. She gave detail of how the iPhone would connect, the signal strength and also that it did so at her grandmother's house, both at well over 25 metres. She said that these experiences were shared by her mother. That was in answer to questions which included "couldn't have been beyond 25 metres; you can't challenge that can you?" In the end, Mr Hamer said: "Well, I'm simply putting to you that according to the evidence that's just not possible." To which the appellant replied: "Yeah, I can't argue with that but I'm just saying what my opinion is."

34. Much of the appellant's evidence was confused, indeed contradictory. For example, she said in her evidence in chief that her boyfriend, who lived 10 minutes' walk away, knew that the doors were often unlocked, then agreed in cross-examination that only she knew. She was cross-examined on the detail of the statements she had made to the police, which were inconsistent on matters such as when she first became aware of the fire engines and precisely where she was at the that time. She was unclear whether the fire brigade had arrived before she called Becky at 02.21.55 (as we had seen they had not). She gave unclear evidence about where she was when she made that call and also about what she did thereafter. The appellant had agreed with Mr Hamer that she was nearer paralytic than sober and the evidence of Becky was that she was hysterical during the second phone call.

35. In his summing up, the recorder reminded the jury about the uncontroversial evidence of the appellant's parents that the family was a close, loving one with nothing to foreshad-

ow behaviour of the sort alleged on the night in question. The appellant was also devoted to her cat, which was rescued by the fire brigade. Some of those with whom the appellant had spent the evening gave evidence of her demeanour. They explained she was quite drunk but not legless. She had been in a good mood all evening and was fine when she was dropped off at about 02.00. There was nothing in her first three-minute call to Becky at 02.03 to cause any concern. She was distraught when she made the second call at 02.21. He reminded the jury that proof of a motive is not a necessary ingredient of an offence, but also that the prosecution case, reflected in count 2, was that the motive was to get her boyfriend out of her life. The jury was reminded about the absence of forensic evidence linking the appellant to the fire.

36. The recorder had allowed the evidence of the earlier false allegation into evidence but directed the jury to be cautious about both that and the admitted lies about whether the relationship with the boyfriend was continuing. The case hinged on the chronology of events from 02.00, the appellant's inability to account for what she doing after her first call to Becky (beyond smoking a cigarette) and her belief that the fire was non-accidental.

37. In that chronology the evidence that the appellant was either in (or very close to) the house at 02.15.04 was, as Mr Hamer accepts, important. It was important because it contradicted the appellant's account that she was still at the corner at that time. It was important because it was agreed expert evidence and it was important because it suggested that the appellant was lying about something at the heart of the events of the night, rather than unrelated matters. The recorder, whilst reminding the jury that the evidence about 25 metres was agreed, also directed the jury to consider her account that the expert evidence must be wrong.

38. We now know that the expert evidence was wrong and that the appellant's account on that aspect of the case was credible. Yet in a prosecution which relied so heavily on her admitted and alleged lies, we consider that this expert evidence was a powerful and damning part of the Crown's case. We accept that, even in the absence of this evidence, there was a case to answer. Our task is not to speculate about what the jury might have done if the agreed evidence had not been before them, but rather to ask ourselves whether, in the light of the fresh evidence, the conviction remains safe, or is unsafe: Section 2 of the Criminal Appeal Act 1968.

39. We took time to consider our judgment at the conclusion of the hearing because we wished to re-read the evidence and summing up to enable that question to be answered. The prosecution case rested upon the premise that the appellant's evidence that her boyfriend had threatened violence was a pretence; there was no doubt that he could be excluded as responsible. It would be too much of a coincidence for him to have been in the vicinity unseen at the same time as the appellant was dropped off and made her way home.

40. We have noted that there was no forensic connection between the appellant and either petrol or fire, or the petrol can. The timing postulated by the prosecution required the appellant to accomplish a good deal whilst drunk in a very short time after her phone connected to the wifi. The prosecution case required her to have gone from being entirely equable, through having fixed upon the plan to set fire to her house and executed it in less than 15 minutes, whilst for much of that time she was smoking a cigarette. It also suggests that her distress in the second call to Becky may well have been contrived. We accept all that is entirely possible. Not without some hesitation, we have concluded that the fresh evidence, undermining as it does an important part of the prosecution case both on timing and also the potency of the appellant's lies, renders the conviction unsafe. In the circumstances we allow the appeal and quash the convictions.

Police Force Hit With £130k Monetary Penalty For Losing Rape Victim Interview

The Information Commissioner's Office has imposed a £130,000 monetary penalty on Humberside Police after disks containing a video interview of an alleged rape victim went missing. The ICO said the three unencrypted disks and accompanying paperwork were left in an envelope on an officer's desk. The bundle contained the victim's name, date of birth and signature as well as details about the alleged rape itself, the victim's mental health and the suspect's name and address. The envelope was due to be posted to Cleveland Police but never arrived. It is not known whether the package was actually sent, the ICO said. An ICO investigation found: Humberside Police failed to encrypt the disks before sending (or intending to send) by unsecure mail; failed to maintain a detailed audit trail of the package; The Protecting Vulnerable People Unit within Humberside Police failed to adhere to its 'Information Security Policy' in relation to removable media.

Steve Eckersley, ICO Head of Enforcement, said: "We see far too many cases where police forces fail to look after disks containing the highly sensitive personal information contained within victim or witness interviews. "Anyone working in a police force has a duty to stop and think whenever they handle personal details – making sure they are using the most appropriate method for transferring information and considering the consequences of it being lost before going ahead. Staff training in this area is vital." He added: "Police forces deal with such sensitive information that when things go wrong, it's likely to be serious. This case shows how crucial it is to keep a clear record of what's been sent, when and who to." Humberside Police has also been asked by the ICO to sign a commitment to take steps to improve its data protection practices.

When Police Just Can't Be Bothered

Simon Warr: While watching a programme this week called 'Unsolved', on BBC 1, about Omar Benguit, who is in prison for ostensibly a murder he didn't commit, I learned that the person who, it is claimed, framed him had accused someone else, previously, of paedophilia. In the documentary a retired murder detective, Brian Murphy, who during his career covered hundreds of investigations, made the following comment: 'A paedophilia allegation is one of the worst allegations you can make.'

Can it be explained, therefore, why the two friends, A and B, who made totally false statements to the police, and subsequently on oath in a court of law, that I had inappropriately touched them both when they were 11 years of age, have not been called to account? Why has the Suffolk police, so eager to have me prosecuted, allowed them to carry on with their lives with impunity?I repeat what the experienced, respected detective, Mr. Murphy, stated: 'A paedophilia allegation is one of the worst allegations you can make.'

But, hey, not to worry; don't anyone be put off lying through your teeth to get your greedy hands on compensation money from the taxpayer, because the police and the CPS couldn't care a fig if you do lie. It seems, if you're rumbled, you'll walk away scot-free. All to gain and nothing to lose. Telling malicious lies which could potentially wreck someone else's life isn't a crime the State recognises particularly. Perhaps because it doesn't curry much public favour.

In my case, A and B lied and lied again and anyone with an IQ above the day's temperature, who listened to the repugnant lies they spouted in court, was left in no doubt they were lying. Yet nothing has been done to punish them.

But Mr. Murphy claims those who falsely allege child abuse have committed a serious crime. Over to you, Suffolk police. I repeat: 'A and B were lying throughout'. Shouldn't they be called to account or aren't you bothered

IOPC Direct Gross Misconduct Charges For 5 Police Officers: Death Of Sean Rigg

The Independent Office for Police Conduct (IOPC) has today announced that they have directed gross misconduct charges for five officers involved in the death of Sean Rigg. Also today, an unprecedented second attempt by PC Andrew Birks to challenge a decision to block his resignation was successful, after the High Court ordered the Met Commissioner to reconsider a decision made in July 2017 to continue Birks' suspension, pending decisions on disciplinary action.

Sean, aged 40, was suffering mental ill health at the time of his arrest and was restrained by Metropolitan Police Officers. He died at Brixton police station on 21 August 2008. The Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) had previously agreed, in November 2017, to bring some gross misconduct charges against four of the five officers involved, except PC Birks. Today's directions not only include PC Birks, but go further in terms of the charges brought.

All key officers involved in this case should have faced disciplinary proceedings well before now. Last month, the IOPC finally came to the end of the process governing disciplinary action, when it directed the Met Commissioner to bring gross misconduct charges against the five key officers, including PC Birks. Were it not for the delays in this process, which could have been completed long ago, there would never have been a need for this judicial review hearing or judgment.

PC Andrew Birks, now also a priest in the Church of England, was the senior officer involved in Sean's arrest. In May 2014, the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) made the decision to suspend Birks and prevent him from resigning. If able to resign, he would not have faced possible gross misconduct proceedings. Birks lost a legal challenge to those decisions in September 2014. Today's ruling is the conclusion of a second judicial review, of the decisions which the MPS have maintained from May 2014 to date. The judicial review was heard at the High Court on 22-23 February 2018. More information here.

Mr Justice Garnham set out in his judgement that "the public interest in favour of maintaining the suspension is substantial", however he concluded that the Metropolitan Police should reconsider their initial decision to block PC Birks from retiring. The judge further set out in the judgment [para 28] the IOPC's view that there was: "a. Failure to identify Sean Rigg as a person with mental health problems and failure to ensure he was unharmed whilst he was under arrest; b. Failure to ensure that Sean Rigg received proper medical attention as soon as it became apparent that he was seriously ill; c. Failure to inform the custody sergeant of information in his possession which would have informed the sergeant so that he could conduct a risk assessment whilst the detainee was waiting outside in the police van."

Sean Rigg's family therefore call upon the Commissioner to act in the public interest by: immediately deciding to continue to suspend PC Birks from duty, and serving PC Birks and the four other officers with notices to finally begin disciplinary proceedings. No delay in starting any disciplinary proceedings should be allowed to happen on the back of this judgment. The family further believe that, as the body entrusted with securing public confidence in the police complaint system, it would be quite wrong for the IOPC to leave this judgment unchallenged. They call upon the IOPC to appeal this ruling, not least because of its potential wider implications concerning the rights of families bereaved by state related deaths to see alleged wrongdoing being addressed through disciplinary proceedings.

Marcia Rigg, campaigner and sister of Sean Rigg said: "My family and I welcome the IOPC's decision to direct gross misconduct charges for officers involved in Sean's death. As we approach ten years since my brother died following unnecessary and unsuitable restraint, we hope that the hearings will take place as soon as possible and provide some much-

needed accountability Ten years on and my family is still suffering delay after delay. The new decision that the Court has ordered should be made immediately. The only sensible decision in the public interest, with the gross misconduct charges having been directed by the IOPC, is for PC Birks to remain suspended, so that he can face those charges."

Deborah Coles, Executive Director of INQUEST said: "The delay and obfuscation in this case has had a punishing impact on Sean's family, who have fought tirelessly for justice for Sean, and indeed for many other families, over the last decade. The delays not only impact families, but frustrate and weaken the processes intended to bring truth, accountability, and policy change. The Metropolitan Police's commitment to accountability for a preventable restraint related death will be judged by their response to this judgment."

Daniel Machover, solicitor for the family said: "Today's judgment is worrying, as it appears to downplay the significance of disciplinary proceedings in securing accountability following deaths in custody or at the hands of state agents. The reality is that the officers involved in this case, including PC Birks, should already have faced disciplinary proceedings well before now. The failings highlighted in this judgement are very serious. For PC Birks to represent the Church of England when he has never answered to those charges of gross professional misconduct would be a travesty. Therefore, any decision regarding PC Birks needs to be made urgently and disciplinary proceedings heard this year; in the meantime the three officers who remain on restricted duties should be suspended in the public interest, given the seriousness of their alleged gross misconduct in connection with Sean Rigg's death." Source: INQUEST

Twenty Dead in Attempted Breakout From Brazil Prison

A number of inmates at a jail in the northern Brazilian city of Belem have died during an attempted mass breakout. They were aided by an armed group outside the jail which used explosives against one of the prison walls. One guard died, as well as 19 prisoners and those helping them from outside. The fighting at the Santa Izabel Prison Complex outside Para's state capital had been as intense as in warfare, the state security service said in a statement. Four other guards were injured, including one seriously. The security service said the prison guards took on attackers from both inside and outside the prison. The authorities are now trying to determine if any of the prisoners managed to escape. Last year 56 people were killed in an uprising in a prison in the city of Manaus in Brazil's Amazon region.

'Enough is Enough': Barrister's Direct Action Grows

Jon Robins, Legal Voice: A murder case at the Old Bailey was reported to be the first hit by barristers' direct action over reforms to the advocates graduated fee scheme. Kema Salum appeared for his first hearing over the death of his wife. The mother-of-one had been repeatedly stabbed in the neck and chest at their home in Haringey. According to a Press Association report, no defence barrister was present to represent him in court. His solicitor, Seona White, of BSB Solicitors, said she had contacted more than 20 chambers but not one barrister was prepared to take on the case. 'I do not know how long the situation will last with counsel not taking on legal aided work. I hope it would be resolved quickly,' she said.

The Law Society Gazette reported that at least 50 chambers had joined the action at the end of last week including Doughty Street, Matrix and 25 Bedford Row. On Friday, 5 King's Bench Walk published a statement saying: 'Enough is enough. It is our responsibility to stand up and refuse to accept cases. We do so with a heavy heart.' 'We cannot ignore the future to come. We judge it

more important that, if we do not take a stand now, we become complicit in permitting our justice system to collapse. We are not prepared to allow it because it is our legacy.'

In a statement by the Criminal Law Solicitors Association published on Friday 06/04/2018, the group said that it would 'liase' with the Bar and provide 'as much information as we can on any barristers who are not accepting work'. CLSA members are also higher-court advocates. 'They face the same issues as the Bar and we are aware that many are also now declining to accept publicly funded work post-April 1,' the CLSA pointed out.

The group warned members that they should 'not allow themselves to be forced into acting as an advocate in a case where by reason of skill, experience, or lack of time to prepare, they do not believe they can properly discharge their duty by acting'. 'The AGFS scheme is not remunerated under the terms of the 2017 crime contracts and firms are under no duty to provide higher court advocacy under the contract,' the CLSA said. 'Should firms choose to instruct an higher court advocate at their firm or another, they must be satisfied that the choice of counsel is appropriate and record their decision on file.'

The CLSA said that it supported the Bar in its 'fight for a properly funded justice system which the public deserve'. 'However, the AGFS issue is not the only fight,' the group said. 'There is of course the litigators' graduated fee scheme which is currently subject to judicial review. At some stage there will be a full review of the litigators' graduated fee scheme as there has been with the AGFS . There are many more areas of contention. At this time unity between the professions is essential now and in the future to ensure not only the survival of our once fair, just and much envied CJS but also the survival of the lawyers who are so important to the running of the system.'

Honourable Deceptions in the Choreography of the Northern Ireland Peace Process!

Paul Dixon, Open Democracy: The war in Northern Ireland claimed approximately 3,700 lives and, by some estimates, injured 40-50,000 people. The Belfast or Good Friday Agreement, 10 April 1998, is the foundation on which an uneasy peace was established. This peace was achieved using 'honourable' deceptions, both large and small. This is the 'inconvenient truth' of the peace process. Populists argue that 'a straight talking honest politics' is possible. Realists claim that deception and hypocrisy is an inevitable part of politics. What is important is to be able to judge between honourable and dishonourable deceptions. In Northern Ireland, the polarisation of the electorate between nationalists, who favoured Irish unity, and unionists who wanted to remain part of the United Kingdom, made the use of deception particularly important in achieving an accommodation. Labour's Secretary of State for Northern Ireland, Mo Mowlam, pointed out that the Good Friday Agreement was deliberately written to be 'open to multiple interpretations'. This meant that unionists could argue that it 'secured the Union' while for Gerry Adams 'it severely weakened it'.

The Belfast Agreement was designed to climax on Good Friday, 10 April 1998. The symbolism of Easter was used to win support for the deal. The final week of negotiations had been carefully choreographed to give 'wins' to all the parties supporting the deal to maximise public support. The US Senator, George Mitchell, had been given a position paper by the British and Irish governments. He was asked by the two governments to present this to the Northern Irish parties as his, rather than their, best estimate of where agreement might be achieved. Mitchell realised the paper was too pro-nationalist because of its emphasis on a strong all-Ireland dimension. 'As I read the document I knew instantly that it would not be acceptable to the unionists.' But he went ahead with the charade and presented the 'Mitchell document' as his own work.

The purpose of the paper was, most likely, to create a drama at the beginning of the final week of talks. John Taylor MP, a leading figure in the more moderate Ulster Unionist Party, declared

that he would not touch the proposals with a 'forty-foot bargepole'. Even the centrist Alliance party rejected the proposals. This 'crisis' was the cue for the Labour Prime Minister, Tony Blair, and the Irish Taoiseach, (Prime Minister) Bertie Ahern to fly in and take the stage for the final days of negotiation. Blair rejected soundbites but nonetheless 'felt the hand of history on his shoulder'.

The Hand of History and Decommissioning: The British Prime Minister's role was to 'rescue' the process and reassure unionists that the Union was safe. He rejected 'Mitchell's paper' as too pro-nationalist. The Ulster Unionist Party leader, David Trimble, was handed a unionist victory. Unionists claimed that Blair 'humiliated' the Irish Prime Minister. The Irish government claimed Ahern had 'reached out' to unionists. Several participants in the talks suspected choreography. Seamus Mallon, of the nationalist Social Democratic and Labour Party, was 'confident' that changes to the Mitchell document 'had been anticipated'. The republican newspaper An Phoblacht reported, 'The suspicion is that the UUP's speedy rejection was pre-planned'. The Ulster Unionist Party won their 'victory' on the all-Ireland dimension on the Tuesday of Easter week. Negotiations continued, and at 3am on Good Friday morning the nationalist SDLP then won their victory by securing a strong, power-sharing executive.

Sinn Fein, the political wing of the IRA, and loyalist paramilitaries secured a 'victory' on the release of paramilitary prisoners. Gerry Kelly, from Sinn Fein, approached the loyalists arguing that they should adopt a common front on prisoners, demanding their release within a year. Remarkably, the loyalists argued against one year and insisted on two years. They did so out of concern for the UUP because they believed that David Trimble would not be able to sell an Agreement to the unionist electorate that released all prisoners within a year.

Decommissioning had already become they key bone of contention in the peace process. Unionists argued that the IRA should at least start decommissioning to demonstrate their sincerity in entering the democratic process. It was undemocratic, they argued, for republicans to use the threat of violence to extort concessions from the other non-violent parties. The IRA claimed that decommissioning was a humiliating demand for surrender. The UUP rejected the Agreement's wording on decommissioning because it did not provide strong enough assurances. At the last moment Tony Blair provided a 'side letter' to the UUP on decommissioning. John Taylor MP, the Unionist deputy leader, was seen as a unionist hardliner. When he declared that he was now satisfied on decommissioning, this was thought to have reassured some wavering UUP sceptics. Close observers of the peace process have suggested that Taylor played the role of a 'shill' or plant. Taylor plays the role of a sceptic who, after the side-letter, 'buys into' the deal and this encourages others to overcome their scepticism. This is a charade because all along Taylor was going to endorse the deal because he was allied to David Trimble, the UUP leader.

Theatrical Skills: Not all in the UUP were sold on the Agreement. Jeffrey Donaldson MP walked out of the negotiations because he did not believe that the wording on decommissioning was strong enough. He later joined the DUP, which opposed the GFA in 1998, but signed up to a similar deal at St Andrews in 2006. David Trimble later accepted that he had not got strong enough wording in the Agreement on decommissioning. But the alternative to accepting the GFA was for him to walk away from a deal that stood the best chance of bringing peace to Northern Ireland since the violence began in the late sixties. In the Referendum campaign to endorse the Agreement, when it looked like decommissioning was not required, unionist opinion shifted towards a 'No' vote. Tony Blair used 'hand written' pledges and implied that the GFA required more than decommissioning. This was an 'honourable deception'. The Prime Minister had good reason to believe that without this deceit the Referendum would fail, and this risked a return to a war.

On 22 May 1998 'Yes' won the Referendum on the Agreement. A few weeks later leg-

islation was introduced at Westminster that resulted in the first release of paramilitary prisoners in September 1998. In December 1999, Sinn Fein took their seats in the powersharing executive. The IRA did not begin decommissioning until 23 October 2001, in the wake of 9/11.

Political actors used their 'theatrical skills' to achieve peace in Northern Ireland. Deceptions both large and small were perpetrated. Hypocrisy was used by actors to present different faces to different audiences. Many of these deceptions were 'honourable' because, in some situations, the end does justify the means. In these anti-political times it is useful to remember the positive role political actors can play in making the world a better place.

High Court Orders UK Government to Hand Over Police File on Libya Torture

Scottish Legal News: The High Court has ordered the UK government to hand over a suppressed Metropolitan Police file that recommended charges against a senior MI6 officer for his role in the illegal rendition and torture of opponents of Libyan dictator Colonel Gaddafi. The 400-page report was the result of a four-year investigation codenamed Operation Lydd. UK government lawyers have been resisting its disclosure in the ongoing legal claim by Abdul Hakim Belhaj and his wife Fatima Boudchar who were kidnapped, tortured by the CIA , and rendered to Libya with the knowledge and assistance of MI6 in 2004. Fatima was pregnant at the time. The investigating officers recommended Sir Mark Allen, a former top MI6 officer, was charged with misconduct in public office but the Crown Prosecution Service refused to follow that advice. The decision not to charge Sir Mark is subject to a separate legal challenge. Along with the report, the government has also been ordered to hand over evidence given by 75 witnesses, mostly other government officials interviewed by the police. Cori Crider, attorney for Mr Belhaj and Ms Boudchar at Reprieve, said: "Piece by piece the government's wall of secrecy is crumbling. Ministers have fought for years to deny Abdul-Hakim and Fatima justice by using every legal trick in the book."This categorical police report makes a mockery of their refusal to admit the role of MI6 and Sir Mark Allen in illegal torture and rendition. There is surely only so much longer they can waste taxpayers money on this fruitless resistance."

HMP Spring Hill

HMP Spring Hill is an open prison in Buckinghamshire holding over 300 category D prisoners. Most men were coming towards the end of long sentences, and one of the prison's main aims was to test their readiness for release and help prepare them for this step. To this end, prisoners were allowed more freedom to make their own day-to-day decisions and, critically - subject to risk assessment - were given opportunities for release on temporary licence (ROTL). Although at our last inspection in May 2014 we had found that the prison was doing some good work, its performance had been adversely affected by tragic events resulting from a prisoner reoffending in 2013 while in the community on ROTL. It was therefore heartening that at the present inspection the prison had made progress in many of the areas we looked at, although there remained a number of important issues to address.

The number of absconds had increased. An analysis done by the prison showed that the majority of absconds involved indeterminate-sentenced prisoners (ISPs) who were fairly new to living in open conditions after having spent many years in closed conditions. Some action was being taken to address this but more needed to be done to ensure these men were more supported during their first few months, to help them settle in and live confidently in open conditions.

Communal and external areas were clean and prisoners were able to move freely around the pleasant grounds. Some of the residential units were dilapidated and in need of significant refurbishment or rebuilding. While the prison attempted to mitigate these problems with temporary fixes, the conditions in a few units were unacceptable. More generally, the heating system was inadequate and the hot water supply unreliable. The solutions to these deficits were not in the gift of the local management team, and the prison needed significant capital funding to resolve them. Equality and diversity work was reasonably good overall, although more work was needed to provide sufficient additional support to those with some protected characteristics. Complaints were now reasonably well managed and health care provision was strong. However, prisoners continued to be less positive about the quality of staff-prisoner relationships than we usually see in open prisons. The reasons for this were complex but managers had taken proactive steps to improve the approach of some staff, and these efforts needed to be further improved and maintained.

Education, skills and work provision had improved since our last inspection and prison leaders had provided a real impetus to developing a wide range of useful partnerships, particularly with employers, some of whom now saw the prison as a source of reliable and effective employees. ROTL was being used extensively to this end, and the day-to-day management of placements was good. Prisoners who were not eligible for ROTL were encouraged to attend activities within the prison and there were sufficient places for all of them to do something. However, more needed to be done to motivate those who still needed to improve their functional skills to engage in education before moving on to other activities.

Children and families work had improved, and prisoners were generally well supported in maintaining contact with their children, families and friends; ROTL was, again, used well in this regard. Most offender management support was appropriate and nearly all prisoners had up-to-date offender assessment system (OASys) assessments which reflected their move to open conditions. Public protection work was generally good, and ROTL assessments were adequate. However, the ROTL board process needed to be more robust and not merely rubber-stamp recommendations made by these assessments. There was a good focus on supporting prisoners to prepare for release, and an appropriate range of practical assistance was offered.

The prison benefited from clear leadership, a motivated management team and a clear plan around how they wanted to improve the prison further. Some significant challenges remained, and it was encouraging that the governor understood and accepted the need for further work to focus on these areas. In terms of the conditions of the residential units, the prison needed external assistance to bring these up to an acceptable standard. In the key area of helping prisoners to prepare for release, the prison was doing better than previously, but needed to ensure that all supporting processes for ROTL were robust and provided sufficient reassurance. Nevertheless, this was an encouraging inspection overall, with outcomes for prisoners improving in two of our healthy prison tests and outcomes at least reasonably good or better in all four.

Hostages: Sally Challen, Naweed Ali, Khobaib Hussain, Mohibur Rahman, Tahir Aziz, Roger Khan, Wang Yam, Andrew Malkinson, Michael Ross, Mark Alexander, Anis Sardar, Jamie Green, Dan Payne, Zoran Dresic, Scott Birtwistle, Jon Beere, Chedwyn Evans, Darren Waterhouse, David Norris, Brendan McConville, John Paul Wooton, John Keelan, Mohammed Niaz Khan, Abid Ashiq Hussain, Sharaz Yaqub, David Ferguson, Anthony Parsons, James Cullinene, Stephen Marsh, Graham Coutts, Royston Moore, Duane King, Leon Chapman, Tony Marshall, Anthony Jackson, David Kent, Norman Grant, Ricardo Morrison, Alex Silva,Terry Smith, Hyrone Hart, Glen Cameron,Warren Slaney, Melvyn 'Adie' McLellan, Lyndon Coles, Robert Bradley, John Twomey, Thomas G. Bourke, David E. Ferguson, Lee Mockble, George Coleman, Neil Hurley, Jaslyn Ricardo Smith, James Dowsett, Kevan & Miran Thakrar, Jordan Towers, Patrick Docherty, Brendan Dixon, Paul Bush, Alex Black, Nicholas Rose, Kevin Nunn, Peter Carine, Paul Higginson, Thomas Petch, Vincent and Sean Bradish, John Allen, Jeremy Bamber, Kevin Lane, Michael Brown, Robert Knapp, William Kenealy, Glyn Razzell, Willie Gage, Kate Keaveney, Michael Stone, Michael Attwooll, John Roden, Nick Tucker, Karl Watson, Terry Allen, Richard Southern, Jamil Chowdhary, Jake Mawhinney, Peter Hannigan.